



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

seem, as a matter of actual holding, rather to disprove the existence of this class than to confirm it. And on pp. 68-69, a case really determining that the mere keeping of a vicious domestic animal with knowledge of its propensity constitutes the gist of the action and that it is unnecessary to prove negligence appears to be employed by the author to illustrate his generalizations upon the absolute liability imposed regardless of scienter upon the owner of an animal of a ferocious species. Furthermore, Dr. Robson's statement that scienter is presumed by law in actions based upon injuries caused by animals of notoriously dangerous species seems to be unnecessarily strained and artificial. It seems to be much less academic, less confusing and closer to the truth to say merely that in actions of this nature the plaintiff is not required to prove scienter and that the defendant is not permitted to require its proof by the other party. For the most part, however, there is little to criticize unfavorably about the accuracy of the author's conclusions.

The typographical arrangement might be improved. Each general proposition advanced by Dr. Robson stands out, properly enough, in bold-face lettering at the head of its section. But the author's reasoning and comments upon the judicial decisions cited by him as authority have been printed, unfortunately, in type the same as that used for reprinting extracts from the opinions themselves. Consequently unconscious transition from judicial utterances to the writer's commentary and vice versa is rendered dangerously easy and to keep his bearings and maintain the necessary perspective the reader is compelled to watch constantly for quotation marks and other indicia of approaching changes of subject-matter. This is annoying and might have been avoided easily. It is difficult to understand why some simple plan such as printing all excerpts from opinions in special lettering was not adopted in preparing for the press this volume, which otherwise sustains admirably the traditional excellence of English typographical standards.

It is to be regretted that the author confined his treatise wholly to the English law and did not see fit to discuss the law of America. The jurisprudence of the two countries is so similar and decisions of each nation are cited so frequently in the courts of the other that any text-book not including within its compass full consideration of the laws of both seems like "Well begun is half done." Yet Dr. Robson cites only one American decision and quotes only one American author. For this reason he scarcely ought to expect his book to make a wide appeal this side of the Atlantic. But if another edition were prepared containing footnote references to pertinent American cases the text would no doubt prove to be of as much "service to practitioners and...those...interested in theories of law" here in the United States as it is bound to be in its present form to those the writer set out to benefit—the lawyers and law students of Great Britain.

Thomas A. Larremore.

INTERNATIONAL LAW TOPICS AND DISCUSSIONS.—NAVAL WAR COLLEGE. Washington, D. C. 1915. pp. 169.

This small volume consists of a discussion of some of the questions of international law, particularly those dealing with naval warfare. Under the four headings of (1) Classification of Public Vessels, (2) Regulations Relating to Foreign Ships of War in Waters Under the

Jurisdiction of the United States, (3) Bombardment by Naval Forces, (4) Submarine Mines, some of the recognized rules are related. However, most of the space is devoted to a discussion of the codification on these points, a discussion looking both to the past and to the future.

The book will prove interesting to those who have followed the events of the present armed conflict, resulting from the naval policies of the various belligerents. The casual reader will perhaps be misled into believing that the Hague Conventions *per se* dealing with the rules of warfare are international law. A careful scrutiny, however, of the notes and context will correct this.

The appendix contains a proposed manual of laws of maritime warfare voted by the Institute of International Law at its session at Oxford in 1913.

Hamilton Vreeland.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A SKETCH OF ENGLISH LEGAL HISTORY. By FREDERICK W. MAITLAND and FRANCIS C. MONTAGUE. Edited with Notes and Appendices by JAMES F. COLBY. New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS. 1915. pp. x, 229.

PRUSSIAN MEMORIES, 1864-1914. By POULTNEY BIGELOW, New York; G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS. 1915. pp. xiii, 197.

LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION. By HARLAN F. STONE, LL.D. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1915. pp. vii, 232.